

**OSU McDONALD-DUNN RESEARCH FOREST FMP
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #6**
Wednesday, March 1, 2023

Website: <https://cf.forestry.oregonstate.edu/our-forests/mcdonald-dunn-forest-plan>

Action Items

- OC will send out a scheduling poll for the rescheduled field tour (weekday afternoons)
- COF will share the field tour documents electronically
- SAC will share additional edits or comments on the 'Management Strategy' definitions before the FPC meeting on Monday, March 6th

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members present: Jennifer Beathe, Mike Kennedy, Jim Fairchild, Leo Williamson, Dave Ehlers, Faye Yoshihara (via Zoom), Jessica McDonald (via Zoom), John Taylor (via Zoom), Kaola Swanson (via Zoom), Trey Jackson, Jesse Ott

OSU College of Forestry Staff present Holly Ober and Stephen Fitzgerald

Oregon Consensus Facilitation Team: Turner Odell and Jennah Stillman (via Zoom)

Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Overview

Turner Odell welcomed the group, invited everyone to do a round of introductions, and then provided a review of the agenda. He shared that the bulk of the meeting would focus on the management strategy definitions and as time permits, reflecting on potential scenarios for modeling. He also reviewed the meeting materials that had been shared in advance, which included updated versions of the Overarching Principles and the SAC Input Summary.

Field Tour Recap

Those who participated in the first field tour shared that they felt that it was a valuable experience that helped put conversations and concepts into perspective related to FMP development. Some noted that it was helpful to see examples of the five different management strategies on the ground, and some added that they felt this effort was on the right path. Holly Ober, College of Forestry, shared that the second, weekday option field tour had been canceled due to inclement weather and road conditions but will be rescheduled in short order.

McDonald-Dunn Management Strategies

Holly shared a presentation that provided an overview of the five new, proposed 'Forest Management Strategies' which included Even-aged, short rotation; Even-aged, long rotation; Multi-aged, multi-species; Managed reserves; and Ecosystems of concern. She shared the background context around the Faculty Planning Committee's extensive conversations and intention that went into developing these definitions. Holly then walked through Even-aged, long rotation example and reviewed the guiding principles, opportunities created, stand establishment, intermediate treatments,

stand age, and legacy elements. Following this, Holly reviewed the rest of the management strategies.

Stephen Fitzgerald, College of Forestry, reviewed the spectrum of potential silviculture treatments and provided examples of how different management approaches play out over time with regard to the canopy cover, understory composition, and stand ages. He reviewed two-age harvest, variable retention harvest, and group selection and the considerations that go into them throughout the forest. He also presented a conceptual diagram that depicted each of the proposed ‘Management Strategies’ and the intensity of management correlated with it, outlining both initial treatments and ongoing maintenance treatments. He explained that the Ecosystem of concern strategy would require more intensive initial treatment and then, once set into preferred status, would shift into general upkeep.

Holly then reviewed the general proportions of the ‘Management Strategies’ on the landscape to demonstrate the approximate current baseline and noted that there will be two upcoming Academic User Listening sessions to learn more about ongoing and potential future research to take into consideration with the allocations.

- Even-age, short rotation (27%)
- Even-age, long rotation (29%)
- Multi-aged, multi-species (21%)
- Managed reserves (4%)
- Ecosystems of concern (6%)
- Long-term learning used for research, recurring teaching, and demonstration (15%).

SAC feedback included but was not limited to

Opportunities Created

- Shift this section down lower in the document altogether
- Across all, add “assess net carbon sequestration”
- Consider measurement indicators to quantify and account for opportunities
- Statements that are comparative in nature are concerning because there’s a lack of clarity as to whether comparisons are intended to be among strategies or to some undefined reference.
- The inclusion of subjective statements (e.g., aesthetics) is concerning.
- Caution should be exercised in making assumptions regarding the relative ability of forests in any one strategy to store carbon relative to any other. This is not known at this time but could be tested.
- Clarify when underburning might be used. Use of fire is not mentioned in any other section of the document other than this. Would it be used just for experiments or as a management tool?
- Perhaps this section should be removed from the document. All other sections describe how to operationalize each of the management strategies, whereas the function of this row is to provide a justification for why each strategy is worthy of being represented in the research forests. If this table appears in the actual forest plan, the information in this row would likely be removed and placed either in a separate table or in the text. If in a separate table, it might be organized in rows that show relative comparisons among the strategies (e.g., one row for carbon, one for biodiversity).

Stand Establishment

- For *even-aged long rotations*, clarify how staff would operationalize preservation of hardwood resprouts if there were numerous treatments during years 1-3. How would they know it's 10%?
- For *even-aged short rotations*, consider rewording the statement about pre-commercial thinning (PCT) to make it clear that although initial planting density would be selected so as to avoid needing to do a PCT, that would be allowable if it were later determined to be necessary.
- For *even-aged long rotations*, include a similar statement about selecting a density that would avoid PCT, but that it would be allowable if it were later determined to be necessary.
- Add, "with the intent to avoid..."

Stand Age

- Consider carefully what the most appropriate upper age limit would be for stands under the "long rotation" management strategy.
- Clarify that the age of alders in riparian areas will not continue to increase over time, because the lifespan of alder is rather short.

Guiding Principles

- Indigenous knowledge is currently only specified for 2 of the 5 management strategies (managed reserves and ecosystems of concern). Consider if it should be included for all five, or is inclusion of Indigenous knowledge explicitly stated elsewhere in the plan?
- Consider why appreciation for values is included only for *multi-aged/multi-species* rather than for all strategies. If there's good justification for this, make that more apparent.

General Comments & Concerns

- How will the updated rules of the Oregon Forest Practices Act influence the allocation of acreage to management strategies? Would all land affected by the updated rules of the Oregon Forest Practices Act be considered managed reserves or ecosystems of concern or will it be yet another segment of the pie charts of acreage that can't neatly fit into any management strategy? It will likely be a while before we know how much acreage will be affected (stream surveys must be completed to determine this), so consider what approach to use in the meantime.
- Similarly, how will the acreage set aside for *long-term learning* be accounted for when modeling? This 15% of the acreage may not fall into a management strategy, but it does provide benefits (e.g., revenue, carbon storage) so shouldn't be forgotten.
- Consider how feasible it will be to move stands from an existing Theme from the 2005 plan to a new management strategy.
- Consider removing subjective statements (i.e., aesthetically appealing)

Next Steps

Holly reviewed the 2023 Engagement Timeline for Product Development which outlined the upcoming meetings, input opportunities, broader community engagement, and feedback loops related to the upcoming scenario modeling and the rest of the FMP development going forward.

The meeting was then adjourned.